

**Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting
November 1, 2017
Michael DeCarbo & Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs**

Attendance: Ruth Babeshoff, Steven Deeley; Chrissy Gascon, Joyce Wagner Joe Geissler, Rosalba Hernandez, Roberta Tragarz, Alice Ho, Marilyn Flores, Christian Vargas and Nhu Phan – Student Representatives

Santiago Canyon College
Mission Statement

Santiago Canyon College is an innovative learning community dedicated to intellectual and personal growth. Our purpose is to foster student success and to help students achieve these core outcomes: to learn, act, communicate and think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing an accessible, a transferable, and an engaging education to a diverse community.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	TASKS/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome		
2. Announcements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christian Vargas announced that ASG Senate is hosting a Town Hall, two-day event, November 15-16, 10 a.m. to 2 p.m., in Stringer Plaza; SCC administrators will speak to students; a Q and A will follow. 	
3. Reports from Governance Committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Technology Committee</i> (Alice Ho) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Alfonso reported that he had filled two (2) IT positions ➤ The Student Portal is closed for testing ➤ The SCC homepage Blackboard link will be revised to a Blackboard/Canvas link ➤ The SCC homepage? will be replaced with First Class programs ➤ Don Busche is creating an accessibility page, policy, and a form for users to report any accessibility issues • <i>Budget Committee</i> (Steven Deeley) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The College budget is on track ➤ The Committee reviewed the resource requests over the last three (3) years, which will be presented in the PIE meeting today ➤ Training will be offered to review specific parameters for funding for equipment, library materials, and lottery funding, to explain how the funding may be used ➤ Steven was asked to carry to the PIE Committee, an issue Carry back to budget committee: District purchase order – disconnect between timeline between granted and Best process to follow to expedite our purchase orders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steven was asked to carry back this information to the Budget Committee: There is a disconnect between the timeline at the point where funding is granted. There is a best process to follow to expedite purchase orders.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Facilities Committee</i> (Arlen Satele) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The work in the D Building has been completed • <i>Student Success and Equity Committee</i> (Ruth Babeshoff) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Committee has reviewed data on degree and certificate completion ➤ PowerBI will be demonstrated next meeting; the Committee is reviewing data in a more intentional way • <i>Enrollment Management Committee</i> (Joyce Wagner) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Committee discussed data from Fall to Spring, ➤ SCC is losing students as compared with other colleges—why? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Distance Education availability? ❖ Less drops? ❖ what would it take to increase or sustain the Distance Education Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the Committee has requested a researcher via a resource request ▪ Working with marketing firm on marketing tools 	
<p>4. Approval of October 4, 2017, minutes</p>		<p>The minutes were approved without dissent and with two corrections (moved by Steven Deeley and seconded by Joe Geissler).</p>
<p>5. Education Futures Grant – Request for Authorization to Apply for a Grant</p>	<p>Janis Perry presented information for approval of her Request for Authorization to apply for a grant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not a request for a new program, but a funding stream to sustain the current Pathways to Teaching Program; • This grant will provide \$110,000 for 2 year to sustain the current campus program, to develop teaching pathways programs for the other seven (7) Region 8 community college, and to facilitate high school articulation. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: Are general funds being requested? Answer: No • The grant includes backfill for Janice in Counseling • Marilyn clarified that the previous grant did not allow FTES collection for the education classes; this new grant requires the classes to be funded by general funds so FTES can be collected • If the new funding is not approved, the classes will continue to be offered but there will be no wrap-around support services • Letter of interest has been submitted and applications will be sent out December 18th 	<p>Joe Geissler moved to approved the request and Arlene Satele seconded. The request was approved unanimously.</p>

6. Three-Year Funding Recap from Budget Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Budget Committee was asked for information regarding what was funded the last three years through resource requests/PIE This information verifies that there is funding available. 	
7. Additional One-time Allocation to 2017-2018 Resource Requests	<p>Discussion about how to award additional one-time funding to PIE of \$65,500:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use this one-time funding to prioritize partially funded items from last year and approved items that were not? <p>Aaron re-ordered the 2017-2018 prioritization as unfunded items, with the exception of personnel and on-going expenses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion: add two back-up unfunded items, in case, after partially funded items and items that were approved but not funded, there are funds remaining Revision: <i>Instructional Supplies</i>: Item #3, MUN be revised down to \$20,000. Suggestion: Fund all of the #1 items Revision: <i>Non-Instructional Equipment</i>: Item #1, Utelogy be revised up from \$10,000 to \$25,000 for additional costs Points can be used to prioritize partially funded and approved items that were not funds as all #1 and #2 items in each category are in the same range Items in larger categories are disadvantaged and items in smaller categories are advantaged. Should instructional supplies have priority over non-instructional supplied? Review for additional costs and let requestors know that the cut-off may be higher Items that were partially funded but approved last year, should be at the top of the list PIE should go back to the requestors and confirm the original costs before funding is set Rank order and then fund until money is depleted Move Items #4 and #8 to the top of the funding list 	<p>Roberta Tragarz moved to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> accept this list (that was re-sorted for partially funded items and approved items not funded) contact the requestors to ask if they are willing to agree to the one-time only funding continue down the line until funds are exhausted, <p>Ruth Babeshoff seconded, and it was approved unanimously.</p> <p>Ruth Babeshoff requested that comments be written on the list noting items that were approved, partially or not funded due to funds being depleted above that items or items as a historical context for future funding becoming available.</p>
8. EMP Goal Assessment – Review of Responsible Parties	Postponed	

9. Planning Scenario: What is District's Stabilization/ Recovery Effort is Unsuccessful? (Continued)	Postponed	
10. Questions/Other		
Next meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m. • <u>Wednesday, December 6, 2017, 3:00 to 4:30, E-206</u> 	